UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Spiritual Disability of America - - - - - - - - *Jacob Trapp*

Can Democracy Survive with Capitalism? - - - - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Japanese Lose and Gain in Postwar Shifts - - - - - *Howard F. Van Zandt*

Principles for Civilization - - - - - - - - - - *Randall S. Hilton*

Niebuhr and the Three Bears - - - - - - - - - - *R. Lester Mondale*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIII NUMBER 3

Chicago, July-August, 1947

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Dorothy Bushnell Cole: Member of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Urban League.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

R. Lester Mondale: Minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church of Kansas City, Missouri.

Jacob Trapp: Minister of The Community Church of Summit, New Jersey.

Howard F. Van Zandt: Worldover Press Correspondent.

Kenneth C. Walker: Minister of The Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL— CURTIS W. REESE 43

ARTICLES—
- The Spiritual Disability of America—JACOB TRAPP 44
- Can Democracy Survive with Capitalism?—LEO HIRSCH 46
- Japanese Lose and Gain in Postwar Shifts— HOWARD F. VAN ZANDT 50
- World Congress of Religion 51
- Principles for Civilization—RANDALL S. HILTON 52
- Niebuhr and the Three Bears—R. LESTER MONDALE 53

POETRY—
- Growth—LEE SPENCER 59

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Cultural Heritage—KENNETH C. WALKER 58
- Record of Social Work—CURTIS W. REESE 58
- The Story of a Full Life—DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE 58
- America Must Lead—JAMES M. YARD 59

CORRESPONDENCE—
- The Community Church of New York— DONALD HARRINGTON 59

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 60

THE FIELD—
- Peacetime Conscription 42

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Peacetime Conscription

Declaring that the adoption of peacetime conscription would be a measure of war and preparation for war, 652 clergymen and religious leaders have urged the President and Congress to reject proposals for universal military training and seek instead universal abolition of conscription and universal disarmament.

In releasing the statement to the press, Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers, minister of Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York City, asserted that despite efforts to camouflage universal military training as a means of supporting the United Nations, the adoption of universal military training would be regarded by other nations, and particularly by Russia, as an announcement "that we have no faith in the efforts we and they are making in the United Nations to achieve peace through world organization and disarmament. We shall inevitably arouse suspicions even about the sincerity of our own professions."

The statement was signed by religious leaders, Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant, from every state in the nation. Signers included George A. Buttrick, Allan Knight Chalmers, Rabbi Robert Gordis, John Haynes Holmes, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John LaFarge, S. J.; Rabbi Barnard Mandellbaum, and Edward B. Rooney, S. J., of New York; Albert W. Palmer of Los Angeles; N. C. McPherson of Memphis; Albert Edward Day of Nashville; Ernest Fremont Tittle of Chicago; Bernard Clausen of Cleveland; Henry Hitt Crane of Detroit; Kenneth Latourette of New Haven; Bishop W. Appleton Lawrence of Springfield, Mass.; and Nels F. S. Ferre of Newton Center, Mass.

The statement urged that American people should "refuse to be turned by fear of other nations . . . from our one imperative task, the abolition of war, while there is yet time." Concentration upon a new effort to secure universal disarmament and the international abolition of conscription would, the statement urged, "serve equally to preserve this land from the blight of militarization and dictatorship."

(*Continued on page* 57)

UNITY

Volume CXXXIII JULY-AUGUST, 1947 No. 3

EDITORIAL

There are few subjects on which there is more confused thinking than on that of the freedom of the press as applied to journals of opinion. The right of persons or groups of persons, of institutions or movements, to own, publish, and distribute journals representing their respective points of view is inherent in democracy and is essential to a healthy and vigorous society. This right should be restricted only when its exercise presents clear and immediate danger to the process of democracy itself. But there is no obligation whatever on the part of a publication to violate its own purpose by becoming a vehicle for the fostering of other, and often contradictory, purposes. A journal is not violating the freedom of the press by deliberately excluding propaganda in behalf of purposes other than that for which it exists. The *Daily Worker* and the *Wall Street Journal* are well within their rights when they fit their editorial policy to the framework of their purposes. Similarly a liberal journal may properly insist that the editorial page conform to liberal purposes. There are innumerable issues within the framework of a purpose on which there should be editorial freedom. But there is no inalienable right of editors to use the editorial columns for the fostering of personal purposes contrary to those of the publishers. Elijah P. Lovejoy died in defense of his right to publish an abolitionist paper. He did not die for the right of slaveholders to use his paper to foster slavery.

The President's appointment of the Civil Rights Commission is one of the most important steps taken by the government in an effort to bring American practice into harmony with the American creed of equality. The personnel of the Commission is notably representative of the varied phases of American life. The staff is composed of persons who know their way about and who believe in what they are doing. The report and recommendations of the Commission should offer a program of legislation and action on which liberal forces can unite. Knowledge of what conditions are and what can be done about them should quicken the conscience of the country and speed the fulfillment of the promise of democracy.

The Truman plan and the Marshall proposal combine to give America a sound foreign policy in Europe. The Truman plan says frankly that there must be no further expansion of the Russian area of undue influence. The Marshall proposal calls on the distressed peoples and governments of Europe to take stock of their resources and indicate their needs. All of which plainly means all-out American action in the rebuilding of Europe. In order to make this action effective, America must be realistic enough to recognize that Europe can be saved only by the strengthening of social democratic movements. Capitalism as it has been known in Europe and as it is still known in America is out for the Continent of Europe, and there is no possibility of restoring it. But social democracy can be made to work effectively, and it can preserve and extend the liberties that the democratic tradition cherishes. If America fails to assess correctly the economic, social, and political trends of the modern world it will lose its position of leadership. There must be no American prejudice directed against Socialist Britain. There must be no American sabotage of social democratic movements on the Continent of Europe. If it is at all possible America must cooperate with Russia in the gigantic task of rebuilding Europe; and if this proves utterly impossible then in the ensuing contest between the United States and Russia we shall need the aid of a strongly democratic Western Europe. Let us not be deceived by our stockpile of atomic bombs. The chain reaction of democratic ideas will ultimately prove more powerful than the chain reaction of atomic forces. The statesmanship of America is on trial, and the hope of the world rests on the verdict.

General MacArthur is a military man of great ability and courage. He possesses rare gifts as an administrator and he is a broad and tolerant democrat. No doubt he would have made an effective Christian missionary had he taken to the cloth in his early days. Even now he has a perfect right to become a Christian missionary if he could find some denomination or sect that would sponsor him and defray the necessary expense involved in a missionary undertaking. But General MacArthur has

no right to use his military and political position as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers to foist Christianity on the Japanese people. It is to be hoped that newspaper reports of the General's missionary designs on the souls of the Japanese are greatly exaggerated. He has no mandate from the Allied Powers or from any other source to launch a campaign for the wholesale conversion of the Japanese to Christianity. High ranking Christian authorities, both Catholic and Protestant, should immediately disavow any intention of utilizing the military occupation of Japan for proselytizing purposes. The General is authorized to start Japan on the road to freedom; but he is not ordained as a Christian evangelist and he should not confuse the spiritual foundations of democracy with the dogmas of the Christian faith. Curtis W. Reese.

The Spiritual Disability of America

JACOB TRAPP

The spiritual disability of America is not that of an old person who has wisdom but no strength, but that of a young person who has strength but no wisdom. To understand why in our strength we feel insecure, why in our freedom we lack the character which trusts freedom, and why in our riches we are poor in resources of the spirit, is to understand why the young so often lack poise and character in the sense of definiteness and determination.

This, I think, is one of the factors in the present spiritual disability of America.

Another factor is that in our "reconversion" to peace, as we called it, we quite neglected, despite all the warnings of history, the necessary spiritual reconversion.

After the Revolutionary War, or the War of Independence, a postwar reaction set in. "The agonies of suspense and attention were over," as one historian wrote. "There was a relaxing of tensions, a reaction against the burdensome and the obligatory. The cessation of hostilities brought a welcome furlough to soldier and civilian alike."

In that postwar reaction, as you will remember, there was a resurgence of extreme conservatism, political, social, and religious. A radical in politics was *ipso facto* accused of being an infidel. Deism, the philosophy of the Declaration, whose rationalism and universalism was the glory of the American Revolution, was covered with such obloquy and so defaced with smears that it was deserted by all but a few extremists. America's first Red Scare, brought on by the French Revolution, brought on America's first and worst experiments in suppressive legislation and witch hunting. Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Paine became naughty words rather than great names, as Mrs. Trollope wrote. On the heels of the founding fathers came the funding fathers. Big steals were perpetrated in the name of respectability. Liberalism went into a storm cellar.

After the Civil War came a worse and a more prolonged period of reaction, cynicism, intolerance, big-time thievery, moral letdown. Liberalism again went into a storm cellar.

After World War I came likewise a mood of profound disillusionment. There was nostalgia for the good old times. There was moral collapse, abetting and giving opportunity to large-scale corruption and government connivance in the big grab at the expense of the people. There was again a Red Scare and a witch hunt, presumably brought on by the Russian Revolution, but used to discredit, to harry, to hound, and to persecute liberals and radicals of every persuasion. Liberalism again went into a storm cellar. And the consequences for the world, which looked to America for leadership only to find her prophets repudiated, were tragic.

After World War II the moral letdown was swift, immediate, and devastating. Still bearing the scars of postwar disillusionment a generation ago, the American people warmed to this conflict slowly and with great reluctance. Psychologically it was for us a defensive war. A grim, necessary job was to be done to insure the survival of a civilization under attack. The response to the necessity was magnificent. But the response to the efforts to turn the war into a genuine crusade as well, against Fascism and for democratic liberation of suppressed peoples, was half-hearted and sporadic at best. The response waned as soon as victory was in sight, long before the last shot was fired. The response waned with the stilling of two great voices in behalf of one world, and help and liberation for backward and suppressed peoples—those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Wendell L. Wilkie. With at least one lesson learned from the past, we took up the tasks of tool and plant reconversion before the war came to an end. Of spiritual reconversion, of girding ourselves for the immense tasks and responsibilities and sacrifices of the ruin and hunger and demoralization in the world, of girding ourselves against our own postwar reaction of moral letdown, which would require an effort greater than that of girding ourselves for war—of this there was precious little, and what there was of it was confused and tragically delayed. The churches, who had not grasped the significance of Mussolini, of Ethiopia, of Spain, of Hitler, of Munich, had been spiritually unprepared for the war. Their conversion, such as it was, came mainly during the war and half-heartedly. Still half-convinced of the justice of the war, still in a mood of repentance for being in it at all, they started to work toward a just peace—a goal toward which they brought too little and too late.

Our postwar reaction from the tensions of war, and from liberal aims for that war, against which America was on the defensive more than any of us realized, was swift and devastating.

It began in wartime with preparations for, and dreams and anticipations of, a postwar boom. It continued in wartime with our insistence on including Fascist Argentina in the UNO. It continued on the heels of the armistice with the scrapping of OPA, and

with a rising spiral of prices which fantastically enriched corporations at the expense of the people. A dismal list could be extended of corporate profits so staggering that President Truman, confronted with the facts, on the sheer basis of what the figures add up to, was at length compelled to remove the onus from labor and to put it where it belongs.

Yet, with all this we are, in the world picture as of today, a fantastic island of plenty in a sea of human want. The occupational psychosis of the rich seems to be fear. The richest country in the world, beyond even any comfortable basis of comparison, keeps trying to reassure herself about tomorrow, keeps trying to tell herself that she is secure in her wealth and that there will not be a depression. We are vaguely and obscurely aware that we cannot continue to be prosperous while the rest of the world starves. We cannot go so far as to convince ourselves within our heart of hearts that we alone of all the peoples on this earth deserve such singular and incomparable preëminence of blessings. We would frankly detest adopting the Pharisaic prayer of "O God, I thank thee that I am not as these others." Yet here we stand, starkly preëminent, trying to sell our own careless laxity of riches, our own dogma of maximum possible private ownership, to a world that must desperately manage and plan in order to live, with a chorus of old and new isolationists in our Congress, elected in a postwar reaction, in favor of no outside interventions save those of power politics and imperialism. Of course we feel unsafe, inwardly insecure. Lacking a dynamic of liberalism we turn to the perilous dynamics of power.

We are also to have our postwar witch hunt now, implemented by dangerously un-American legislation, the ostensible purpose of which is a purge of Communists, but the real purpose of which, as only the purblind could fail to see, is to drive liberals into a storm cellar. Our President, who seems to want to ride the wave as advantageously as he can with an eye to 1948, seems to be willing to front for this hysteria, although he confessed in a recent letter to the governor of Pennsylvania that the menace of Communism in this country is a hoax.

Another symptom of our spiritual disability, akin to that of the witch hunt, is an almost pathological avoidance of and reaction against self-criticism. The ill-adjusted, the innerly insecure and immature person, seeks all the blame outside of himself. He seeks also his gratifications outside himself, forever pursuing and failing to find outside of himself what he will never possess, except within. So our ill-adjusted nation, facing away from the demands of maturity, avoids and resents self-criticism, sends a man from a State where forty per cent of the population is disenfranchised to demand a fair election half the world away, puts out a military budget the proportions of which beggar the kind of thing Wendell L. Wilkie warned against in Denver only a few months tbefore he died, stockpiles atomic weapons, secures to itself military bases flanking Europe and solidly confronting Asia, at the same time fiercely criticizing the Soviet Union, in whom it senses a potential rival, for seeking to gain some of that same kind of so-called security nearer home. I think the spiritual insecurity and disability of America is in nothing quite so evident as in our tendency to locate the devil on the other side of the world, and in our tendency, tragic in view of the world's condition and the world's needs, to regard Russia as already a potential or actual enemy. If someday we must fight Russia, and squander staggering scores of millions of lives in so doing, involving the world perhaps in some kind of final holocaust of civilization on this planet, let that evil day not come without our having exhausted every resource of public, honest, persevering, cooperative world effort to build peace. I condemn our attitude even more than our actions.

I have suggested that one cause of our spiritual disability is a postwar moral letdown which we shall have to outlive and outgrow.

But I have not gone into what I consider the real and the deeper cause of our spiritual disability. Emerson, before the Civil War, called it our "metaphysical disability." This last point I must consider all too briefly.

Taking Toynbee's lead—a sound lead, I think—that to understand America you must understand Western civilization, and that to understand Western civilization you must go back to Egypt, Babylonia, the Hebrews, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans, I want to indicate, as briefly as this may be done, what constitutes the greatness of Western civilization, and how the lack of it makes for anarchy, or crass materialism, or spiritual confusion and paralysis.

The true greatness of Western civilizations, going several thousand years back, stems from the dawn of conscience. The dawn of conscience put an *I ought* above human freedom. The high heritage of Western civilization ever since enthrones this *I ought,* this moral imperative, above random impulse and egoistic desire, above the will of the strong as such, as well as the selfish desire of the weak to be rid of their burdens. It roots freedom in virtue. It condemns as sinful the liberty of the original prototype of lawless brotherhood—of the Cain who said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" It glorifies one kind of freedom, the freedom of not being in bondage to the creature, the glorious liberty of the sons of God. In Judaism, in Zoroastrianism, in Greek Platonism and Roman Stoicism, in Christianity, this was freedom under law, freedom *in* brotherhood not against brotherhood, freedom not won at the expense of another's unfreedom, freedom won through transcendence of bondage to self in love and through transcendence of the irrational in truth. Virtue was prior to liberty, and not liberty prior to virtue. Freedom was to be legitimately enjoyed only in the recognition of sanctities and inviolabilities in other persons and in one's self. This is of the very soul of the greatness of Western civilization, and at the very heart of its struggle down through the ages against both tyranny and lawless barbarism. It went, in a more marvelous fashion than we have sometimes appreciated, into the making of the fundamental law of our land, which bound a people together into a covenant of law for promoting the common welfare, with respect to individual and minority rights which the majority, or representatives of the majority, may not violate. Without such safeguards, such common acceptance of inviolabilities, the sovereign majority, who may be ignorant, or avaricious or fearful or intolerant, could become, as de Tocqueville pointed out, the worst of tyrants. The sovereignty of the people is a foolish and dangerous mathematics of mass strength, or of mass subservience, or of mass delusion and suggestiveness, unless sovereign man treats with sovereign man on the basis of mutually inviolable sanctities, unless within the concept is included the concept of the sovereignty

of ethics, as Jefferson carefully pointed out, and as our founding fathers wisely enacted.

The deepest cause for America's spiritual disability, I am profoundly convinced, lies in our failure fully to grasp and explicitly to teach and to develop this high heritage of Western civilization.

It so happens that this high heritage—of justice as the condition of freedom—has had significant embodiments and grand reinforcements in the American tradition. We are not as sick as our symptoms would make us appear to be, so that there is no health and wholeness in us, but we have vast reserves, inner and spiritual resources of the meaning and soul, of the living heritage and tradition of America, if we will but understand them, believe in them, and call upon them.

I would not be permitted in the Soviet Union to criticize official policy as here without question I am permitted to do. I could do so there, perhaps, as freely as this, only at the cost of my life. This would be true also in other police states, authoritarian governments or personal dictatorships, such as Greece, Turkey, Spain, Argentina, China, Portugal, and several other countries; also of certain colonial dependencies, if I happened to be a native. The precious legacy of freedom, freedom under the sovereignty of ethics, and ethics rooted in human inviolabilities, has great regions still to permeate and to liberate.

America can be a liberator and a leader, an enlarger of the areas of freedom. How?

First of all by recovering her own soul. First of all by going to school again—she has great teachers—to learn the spiritual significance and prerequisites of democracy. First of all by applying it, as rapidly as men may be converted and not coerced, save under the sovereignty of just law, to our own problems of increasing monopoly and of powerful forces seeking to drive us into a global adventure of American imperialism. The idea of American destiny implemented by force, or of a Pax Americana maintained by force, is the surest road to forging our own chains and leading the world not toward liberation but disaster.

Secondly, by standing for and assisting such forces of liberation, true liberation of a better chance at livelihood, at freedom with opportunity and justice, wherever anywhere in the world such forces appear or are at work—assisting them with our sympathy and our help first of all, and so long as this road remains open to us, through the United Nations, thereby strengthening that body not only with the immense prestige of our power but also with the kind of moral leadership the world has a right to expect from us. For we are the land that from the four quarters of the earth gathered oppressed peoples to the dynamic of a new hope, the prophetic dream and promise of Western civilization—namely opportunity, fair play, freedom, and brotherhood, in justice.

America, do you fear the contagion of democratic ideals, or do you believe in them, and want to put them to work? For these are the trumpets that will make the walls of tyranny come tumbling down.

Can Democracy Survive with Capitalism?

LEO HIRSCH

Few would deny the proposition that this is the most important basic question of the times in which we live. Even fewer would deny that it is also the most controversial question of all those that are being posed in the great debate in which the nations of the world are now engaged. For that reason, definition of terms is the first necessary step in approaching this question.

Democracy is a political system, and one error that we Americans often make is to regard our own particular form of democracy as embracing and including the whole. Actually, democracy is much older than the United States. We know of no period in the history of human civilization in which many men in many places did not cleave to the idea of democracy, and fight and struggle to put it into operation. Aristotle, for example, defined democracy for his own time in the following words: "A democracy is a state where free men and the poor, being the majority, are invested with the power of the state . . . that the poor shall be in no greater subjection than the rich; nor that the supreme power shall be lodged with either of these, but that both shall share it."

Our own American democracy is based upon two extremely important documents, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. The first of these states, in words familiar to every American school child:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States declares:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The important thing for us to note in these two quotations is that the power of government, in both instances, is clearly and explicitly defined as deriving from the people themselves. There are a number of implications to be drawn from this proposition. One of them is that the rights, not just of one individual or of one group of individuals, but of all individuals must be cherished and defended in a democracy. Another one is that among those rights is included the right to work at wages or salaries which will permit the worker to provide for himself and his dependents decent shelter and clothing, adequate and nourishing food, and the right and opportunity of full and free use of his hours of leisure. There are many other implications, but for the purposes of the present discussion, it is these two with which we are chiefly concerned.

Democracy, then, is a dynamic political principle, evolving out of the long centuries of experience to the effect that if men are to grow, to learn, and to create, they must be free. It is an affirmative philosophy, as David Lilienthal so brilliantly described it at a recent hearing before the Senate of the United States. It is a pattern of political conduct designed to remove the evil inequalities in human relationships. For this

reason, democracy has captured the imaginations and the loyalties of millions of men and women throughout the long history of civilization, and it will continue to do so as long as its own ideals are being realized.

That the ideals of democracy are imperfectly realized, even in the United States which so prides itself upon its democratic way of life, no objective person will deny. For example, although it has been a decade and more since Franklin D. Roosevelt shocked us all with his statement that "one-third of our nation is ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed," this deplorable condition still exists, as a visit to the slum sections of any of our towns and cities will prove. Residential segregation, that undemocratic pattern of life that keeps minority groups, particularly Negroes, locked in slum ghettos, forces many millions of our citizens to pay exorbitant rentals for dangerous and unsanitary firetrap apartments. There is, for instance, a single block of New York City's Harlem area that houses more than four thousand people. If this density of living conditions were duplicated for all of our citizens, the entire population of the country would be forced to live in an area about half the size of the island of Manhattan.

There are numerous sections of our country in which, despite legislation against it, child labor still persists. Every area in which tobacco is grown—and this includes some states that most of us think of as progressive, such as Connecticut, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania—uses child labor.

In seven of our southern states, the poll tax deprives some ten to thirteen millions of American citizens, poor whites as well as Negroes, of their right to vote. This leads to racial hatreds and discrimination which, in turn, produce increasing racial tensions.

There is an intensively increasing tendency for the economic power of the country to be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. Our biggest enterprises are growing bigger, and are intensifying their monopolistic practices, both at home and abroad. One consequence of this is that tens of thousands of small, independent business organizations are constantly being squeezed out and driven to the wall, with resulting loss of capital and of work, with consequent increase of economic insecurity and misery for thousands of people.

These are only the highlights of conditions that, as any observing individual may prove for himself, are a commonplace in this country which we who are its citizens like to think of as the most democratic on earth. It is, therefore, time to raise a question. Since we function under a political system that is solemnly pledged to cherish and to fight for the maintenance of all of the rights of all of its citizens, how can conditions such as we have briefly described exist? Are these conditions in any respect the result of the system of political democracy in which we believe, and which our citizens, as they have time and again proved, are ready to defend to the death?

Obviously not. In fact, were we to practise consistently and honestly the democracy about which we talk so much, these conditions would disappear. It is clear, then, that something is preventing us from achieving a complete realization of the democratic ideals in which we profess to believe.

The clue to this interference may be found in the fact that man is not only a political animal. He is, as well, an economic animal. He can no more live without economic organization than he can without political organization. Man is also an inventive animal, and as his inventions increased, both in number and in complexity, he was compelled to change and to reorganize both his political and his economic systems.

Thus feudalism changed to capitalism, and absolutism changed to democracy as a result of one of man's greatest technological advances—namely the invention and introduction of power-driven machinery, which took place in the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Man's problem, then, and it is a problem which he has not as yet succeeded in solving, is the adjustment of the differences and the conflicts that inevitably arise between his political organization and his economic organization. Both are necessary if he is to continue to survive, but the motives directing the formulation of these two types of organizations are different and opposed. Man's instinct and drive for freedom and liberty largely supplies the motive power for his drive toward political organization. His instinct for acquisition, on the other hand, is the driving motive behind his quest for economic organization. Because of this conflict between two of his strongest instinctive drives, man has not, as yet, succeeded in inventing a political organization that will keep in check the excesses of his economic organization, nor has he invented an economic organization that will either recognize or protect the aims and ideals which he struggles to realize through his political organization.

This conflict explains why we have to raise the question of whether or not our democracy can survive with capitalism.

We have now reached a point in our discussion where it is necessary both to define capitalism and to examine some of the results of its operation. Briefly, capitalism is a system of economic organization whereby the means of production (including, of course, natural resources, land, wealth, factories, machinery, tools and equipment) remain in the hands of, and are controlled by, private individuals or groups of private individuals, who employ the said means of production for their own profit or gain. This they proceed to do through the hiring of labor for wages.

In his economic classic, *The Wealth of Nations,* Adam Smith put the whole credo of capitalism in a nutshell. "The consideration of *his own private profit* is the *sole motive* which determines the owner of any capital to employ it either in agriculture, in manufacture, or in some particular branch of the wholesale or retail trade."

In order to understand the workings of the capitalistic system, we must remember that although the capitalists control the means of production, the only way in which the means of production can be put to use is through the employment of labor. Without labor there is no possibility of profit. The profits, therefore, which accrue to the capitalists represent the difference between the added value which labor contributes to the finished product, and the actual amount which capital pays to labor in the form of wages. This fact is never openly admitted by capitalists themselves, but it is amply demonstrated by the fact that wage-cutting is the overwhelmingly favorite capitalistic device for the achievement of necessary economies in the productive processes.

It is now time for us to examine some of the results of the functioning of the capitalistic system. One outstanding result is the increasing tendency of capital itself to become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands —in other words, the growth of monopoly. Another

result is the increasing tension between capital and labor—a tension that is inevitable as long as the profits which accrue to capital come from the toil and efforts of labor. Under these circumstances, it is inevitable that labor shall organize in order to keep for its own benefit as much as it can of that value which it, by its work and toil, adds to the raw material to create the finished product. Thus we have trade unions and labor organizations.

Since, on the other hand, the profits that accrue to capital come from one source, and one source alone—namely, the added value which labor has contributed to the raw material after labor's wages are paid—and since profits can, therefore, be increased only by increasing the difference between this added value and labor's wages, and since the only way to do that is to decrease labor's wages, we find that capital is inevitably and bitterly opposed to trade unions and labor organizations.

Another result of the functioning of capital is that the system, by its very nature, can only proceed in a series of recurring cycles of "boom and bust." This is because the sole means of accruing profits under capital, as we have already explained, lies in increasing as much as possible the margin of added value that remains after labor's wages have been paid, and the only way in which this margin can be increased, in the final analysis, is by decreasing the wages paid to labor. Thus capital often finds itself in the embarrassing position of having nobody to whom it can sell its products because it has impoverished its customers by decreasing their wages beyond the point where they can afford to buy the products which they have helped to make. For in the final analysis, it is the workers who are the consumers of the products of capitalism—not the capitalists themselves, for there are not enough of them.

We have, of course, for the purposes of brevity and clarity, oversimplified the whole picture. In reality it is much more complex, but for the purposes of this discussion, our simplified argument and explanation will serve to explain the fact that even in a highly democratic country, politically speaking, such as the United States, social and economic inequalities exist that are directly contrary to, and destructive of, the very aims and ideals of democracy itself.

Capitalism's tendency toward monopolistic concentration of wealth has greatly sharpened the struggle, because monopoly spreads beyond national boundaries, and with its immense concentration of power, tends constantly to dictate the economic fate not merely of one nation, but of all nations, of the world itself. This inevitable sharpening of the struggle is forcing new systems of economic and political organization upon the world. Among these new systems of economic and political organization are Socialism, Communism, and Fascism.

None of them, of course, is new in the strict sense of the word. Elements of all three of them are to be found in human society throughout the entire history of civilization, just as elements of democracy and of capitalism can be found in the oldest cultures of which we know anything at all. But, like the philosophies of capitalism and democracy, the philosophies of Socialism, Communism, and Fascism have had to make adaptations to the increasing complexities of political and economic organization that have been created by man's amazingly rapid technological development. Also, as we have already remarked, the struggle is sharpening, and all of these various political and economic philosophies are therefore gaining new adherents.

It is now necessary for us to examine the three doctrines mentioned above, to define and analyze them. It will be remembered that we have already described democracy as a system of political organization, and capitalism as a system of economic organization. Socialism, Communism, and Fascism are in reality all systems of organization that attempt to embrace both the political and the economic factors in human society, and, by thus embracing both factors, resolve the conflict, between them. This, incidentally, is the one and the only characteristic that all three systems have in common—namely that they attempt to deal with both the political and the economic factors of human society.

In the sharpening and increasingly tense struggle between labor and capital upon which the world is now entering, we can look forward to an increasing use of these three politico-economic ideologies as weapons. Socialism and Communism represent the ideological weapons upon which the forces of labor will increasingly rely, while Fascism represents the ideological weapon upon which the forces of capital will increasingly depend. The reason for this is very simple. Socialism and Communism are based upon democratic ideals, while Fascism is based upon the acquisitive aim that is the very seed and structure of capitalism itself.

Socialism has been defined as a middle of the road movement that aims to balance the two extremes of Communism and capitalism. Actually, this is a greatly oversimplified definition.

It is quite true that Socialism shares with Communism the belief that the means of production should be in the hands, not of private individuals or groups of individuals (i. e., capitalists) but in the hands of, and under the control of, the workers themselves. It is also true that Socialism, unlike Communism, believes that this can be accomplished within the framework of the political system of parliamentarism which has been created by the application of the democratic philosophy.

This last is, in fact, the chief difference between Socialism (it would perhaps be more accurate to call it Democratic Socialism) as it is practised today in Norway, Sweden, France, Czechoslovakia, and as it is being introduced today in England, and Communism as it is practised today in Russia. It should be pointed out, however, that the Russians themselves, despite the rule of the country by the Communist party and its functionaries, do not define their present form of government as Communism. Rather they describe it as Socialism—to be exact, the form of Socialism that is the preliminary stage of actual Communism. It should be remembered (and too often it is forgotten) that the initials U. S. S. R. stand for Union of *Socialist* Soviet Republics. The point we are here emphasizing, however, is the difference between this so-called middle of the road doctrine of Democratic Socialism, and the philosophy of Communism. Democratic Socialism expects the economic reorganization of the transfer of the means of production from the control of the capitalists to that of the workers to be accomplished within the framework of democratic parliamentarism. Communism insists that this transfer can be accomplished only by a process of change so deep and so thoroughgoing that it can be described only as revolution.

It should be pointed out at this juncture that both

philosophies have a basis of historical foundation upon which to rest their respective beliefs. For example, the economic changes which England is witnessing today are being accomplished within the framework of her democratic parliamentary system. On the other hand, it took the Bolshevik Revolution itself to bring about the economic changes which transformed Czarist Russia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is probable that these differences of experience can be accounted for only through the technique of political analysis which Lenin himself developed in enunciating his theory of the dynamic quality of the functioning of all political, economic, and social organisms. Even a superficial analysis of the economic and political situation in England today with that which existed in Russia in 1917 will reveal profound and subtle differences. For example, the mechanism of democratic parliamentarism has been perfected in England, and exists at hand there today—whereas Czarist Russia in 1917 contained nothing of the sort.

At any rate, the Communists, while agreeing with the Socialists on the question of the nationalization of the means of production, have no faith in the efficiency of democratic parliamentarism for bringing this about. It must be admitted objectively that there is much support for their point of view in the vulnerability of democratic parliamentarism to the attacks that are inevitably levelled against it by the reactionary forces of capitalism. While it is true that Democratic Socialism can at the present time point to some notable successes, it is also true that its enemies can point to some equally notable failures. One has only to recall, for example, the fate of the Weimar Republic in 1923 which, as we all remember, was followed a decade later by the complete capture of the German government by the Nazi party, in 1933.

Which brings us, as far as definition is concerned, to the matter of Fascism. Before defining Fascism itself, it will be useful, at this point, to clear up one very widespread misconception: namely, the idea that there is no difference whatever between Fascism and Communism. This misconception is one which, for reasons and purposes of their own, the Fascist forces themselves are interested in spreading because, as the forces of reaction, they realize plainly that one supporter weaned away from the cause of Communism is worth ten gained for their own movement. Fascism with good reasons recognizes in Communism its deadliest enemy.

Fascism is a form of politico-economic organization that aims at the preservation of capitalism through the complete and utter destruction of democracy. Under Fascism, not only are the capitalists left undisturbed in their possession and control of the means of production, but their position is further reinforced by placing them in absolute and outright control and possession of the government itself. This is accomplished, not only by the complete destruction of all forms of political democracy, but also by the complete and ruthless stamping out of all forms of economic and intellectual democracy as well. It was not for nothing that the Nazis in Germany, after coming to power in 1933, not only destroyed the German trade union movement, but burned the books and reduced the schools, colleges, and universities of the country to what amounted to penal servitude.

The techniques which Fascism uses to capture the government of a nation are clear and well-developed. In the first place, Fascism appeals to the imaginations of the masses of the people by the promulgation of an exaggerated nationalism, impressing the populace with the idea that they are the members of the superior race. This is accompanied by the spread and advocacy of fanatical racial ideas in order to arouse hatred, discrimination, and mass prejudice against minorities. In this way, the people are divided and, being divided, are easily conquered and deprived of their fundamental rights and liberties. Their economic program is well-organized, and is based primarily on the complete and ruthless destruction of the trade unions and the labor organizations. Once these bulwarks of the workers are gone, it is easy enough to drive all the workers of the country into involuntary servitude. It is notable that in Germany before the outbreak of World War II, all trade union leaders were sent to concentration camps where, in the course of events, they were eventually murdered.

The same general program was followed in the other Fascist countries—in Italy, and in Japan—and is being pursued today in Franco Spain and to a considerable extent in Argentina. Above all, it must be noted that nowhere in the theory or the practice of Fascism do we find any fundamental disturbance of the position and function of the means of production in the hands of the capitalist forces.

Stated thus baldly and nakedly, it is perhaps difficult to understand why Fascism has succeeded and may even succeed again in winning the support of the millions of people whose rights and economic interests it inevitably destroys. It is important to realize that in those countries where the capitalist forces, in a last-ditch struggle to preserve their own position and power, have succeeded in putting over Fascism, this success has been achieved through the diabolical technique of arousing the fears of the people against Communism, and in pretending that Fascism is the necessary bulwark against the spread of "Red" and "radical" ideas.

It is a tragic fact of history that the Hitler regime in Germany gained power through the tacit consent, if not the active help, of the democratic-capitalist countries of the Western world. This tacit consent was given only because the Nazi leaders continually harped and played upon the theme of a necessary bulwark against the spread of Socialism and Communism. Compare Churchill's attitude of today and you will find it fits in with his attitude before 1933.

More tragic still is the fact that not even the enormous toll of lives, blood, sweat, tears, suffering, and money exacted by World War II has succeeded in stamping out the seeds of Fascism. We see them growing in the United States today, in such movements as the Ku Klux Klan, and the Columbians. We see them in the foreign policy which, under the persuasion of men like John Foster Dulles and Arthur Vandenberg, the Truman administration has been persuaded to follow. We see them in the now well-formulated and clearly developed plans of the Republican party to utilize the technique of labor smashing and Red-baiting in the forthcoming Presidential election. We see the sproutings of Fascism in President Truman's no doubt well-meant plans for a "Loyalty Purge" among employees of the Federal government.

We have already had a full dress rehearsal, and a real taste of forthcoming events along these lines in the Senate Committee investigation of the fitness of

David Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Commission for control of atomic energy. We have seen a Senate Committee sit back supinely for six weeks and allow a malicious and ignorant southern Senator, McKellar of Tennessee, to smear a liberal Democrat, whose only crime is that he most ably and conscientiously performed the duties of Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with the labels of "Red" and Communist.

These are unpleasant facts to consider, but they must be considered in any attempt to answer the question posed by this discussion: Can democracy survive with capitalism?

At best, only a contingent answer can be given to our question. Our democratic political system gives the people ample means to withstand any and all attacks upon their fundamental liberties that the Fascist forces can make, but those means can only be effective if the people themselves make use of them. When we consider the fact that practically all of our mass media of education and information are themselves controlled by the forces of capitalism—the newspapers, the radio, the motion pictures, and even the educational institutions themselves—we can be forgiven for wondering, sometimes, if the people can ever be sufficiently aroused to their dangers and their responsibilities to withstand the attack that the Fascist forces are making.

Here it should be pointed out that time and again the American people have shown themselves to be naïve and immature in the field of politics. A notable example of this naïveté and immaturity occurred in the Congressional elections of 1946, when the Republicans swept the country, and quite naturally took their victory as a mandate from the people to reverse everything for which the Roosevelt administration had stood and fought during the last twelve years. Yet every month that has passed since the 1946 elections has contained warnings to the Republicans that their victory was actually no such mandate at all.

Because along with their naïveté and immaturity in the field of politics, the American people have also demonstrated, time and time again, that in moments of crisis they are capable of showing a real wisdom and acumen. They gave a demonstration of this in the years from 1932 to 1944, when, despite the fact that probably no presidential candidate in the history of the country had ever received less support from the press, and from the forces of capitalism in general, the American people calmly continued to return Franklin D. Roosevelt to the White House.

It is interesting, too, to note that most of the protests which the White House received from all over the country against the President's Greco-Turkish policy have emphasized a feeling of strong disapproval that Mr. Truman saw fit to bypass the United Nations.

This is, of course, but a straw blowing in the wind. The indications are that the struggle, which is deepening and intensifying with every day that passes, will be a sharp and a prolonged one. World War II was a struggle against Fascism, even though many people, particularly in the United States, refused to recognize it as such. And Fascism is not dead, because the war through which we have so recently passed was only the opening round of the battle. Capitalism will not give up so easily.

The time for despair, however, has not come. The very system of political democracy that the American people are fighting for and will fight to preserve was, in its creation, a triumph over the forces of reaction. Such a triumph can and will be achieved in the future—we can have no doubt of that. It will come as the result of a long and slow process of learning and education, accompanied by an even longer and slower process of struggle.

Basically, the common man, in America and elsewhere, knows that the price of survival is liberty, and that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. In the final analysis, perhaps the question, after all, is not as we have framed it. Not "Can Democracy Survive with Capitalism?" Rather may it be put the other way: "Can Capitalism Survive with Democracy?"

No objective student of the problem believes that it can, and it is this lesson that the American people, however slowly and painfully, must learn. When they have learned it, as inevitably they will, it will be the capitalist system itself that they will change—not the democracy for which they have fought and died.

Japanese Lose and Gain in Postwar Shifts

HOWARD F. VAN ZANDT

Japan's fishermen, according to a recent survey, are selling 75 per cent of their catch on the black market. In the fall of 1946 Japan enjoyed a much larger rice crop than in 1945, in fact one of the best in years. But despite government efforts, it has been almost as hard to get the rice into legitimate channels as it has been the fish. Late in March, 1947, the official ration was ten days behind schedule. To fall so far behind this early in the year is causing great alarm. Last year it was June before the ration fell as far off schedule.

To get rice, through the spring of 1946, city dwellers commonly went to the country to buy straw bundles filled with grain, carrying them home on the crowded trains. To cut this down and force the rice into legitimate channels of rationing, the Government forbade free purchase. This year, though the amount being sold on the free market is small, the farmers are withholding their harvests expecting to sell at higher prices, legitimately or on the black market later.

The tragedy of the black market is lessened a little by the urbanites who grow some of their own food. The parkways of most of the big cities yielded crops of vegetables last year, and this year will be even more productive, for greater space is available all the time as the bomb rubble of 1945 is cleared away.

In front of busy stores and office buildings, as well as little shops and quiet homes, are neat gardens of radishes, squash and pumpkin. A couple of hundred yards from Shimbashi—Tokyo's "Times Square"—a grocer last summer and fall grew vegetables on top of

rubble three feet high on either side of his store. He had carted in six inches of soil and piled it on top of the fragments of masonry, broken glass, and cinders. In front of his store he had a large display of trays filled with dried grasshoppers; 1945 and 1946 saw quite a demand for this strange food, not a common part of the Japanese diet in normal times. But grasshoppers are not bad—mixed with enough rice.

In Osaka (prewar population 4,300,000) the tops of office buildings in 1946 grew a whole catalogue of vegetables, and this year will be cultivated even more intensively. The Aoyama palace grounds in Tokyo, the Shinjiku Imperial gardens and other properties of the Emperor have been spaded up, and in 1947 as in 1946 will grow much of the food eaten by the Tenno and his household.

More than 5,000,000 Japanese are jobless. But they keep busy among the ruins, tending family vegetable gardens, fishing from the canal banks, sifting through rubble for larger pieces of sheet iron to improve the shacks they live in.

The troubles that afflict the city dwellers are not found in the country. Thanks to the high prices they can get for their produce, fishermen and farmers are now more prosperous than at any other time in recent Japanese history. When you ask a city dweller who pays the terrific prices for restaurant meals—or objects of art—he usually answers in disgust: "Farmers and fishermen."

A few others, too, seem to have plenty of money: storekeepers, contractors, builders, and black marketeers. Hardest hit are wage and salary earners, government employees and people with fixed incomes. But especially injured by the troubles of the times are the women of Japan. Recruited by millions for all kinds of jobs during the war, to replace the men taken for military service, women were in most cases dismissed at once when the war was over. Such jobs as were available after the collapse of the war economy were taken by returning soldiers.

As a further hardship for the women, the efficiency of the Allied Military might, plus the tardy return of prisoners by the Soviet, kept tragically small the number of "boys who came marching home." Japan, it is estimated, has 3,500,000 more females of marriageable age than males. Dislocations caused by the war have further hurt the chances of young women seeking a mate. Marriage contracts agreed to by parents six years ago are often not binding now—the families have been separated by the wholesale burning of cities, and the prospects for employment are too poor to justify pushing new matches, or old agreements.

World Congress of Religion

This announcement, by the Church Peace Union, of the World Congress of Religion in Support of the United Nations, to be held in Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A., October 23-27, 1948, is addressed to people of good will in all nations.

Governmental, scientific, educational, and business agencies are at work to establish world peace. But these forces, essential as they are, lack that fundamental and compelling power which religion alone can provide. The guidance and sustaining strength of religion are needed today as never before.

Nothing in the history of the past can compare in scope to the chaos in world affairs that faces us. Physical ruins of proud nations, the dislocation of the world's economy, disillusioned people, and the stateless, homeless wanderers on the face of the earth create new and perplexing problems that have to be met immediately.

Even greater than the physical ruin is the confusion in thought and the bankruptcy of our emotions.

The atomic bomb hovers over the world with its threat of complete annihilation of our civilization.

Men of great distinction are questioning whether or not our intelligence and our will can save us.

The United Nations is the best instrument yet devised for the purpose of saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." It is committed to promote fundamental human rights; to establish justice; to promote social and economic progress and better standards of life for all peoples; to promote the practice of tolerance; to teach people the way to live in peace with one another as good neighbors; to unite our strength and the use of armed force only for the maintenance of international peace and security. The machinery of the United Nations, with its Assembly, Court, and Councils designed to achieve these ends, is now in operation and has the formal support of most nations and the vast majority of their people.

The United Nations is not an "automatic device." It is simply a tool. Imperfect as that tool may be, it is an implement to be used, for in the long run not machinery but people will determine the success of the organization. This Congress will seek to show that just as the scientific man has made the world into "one neighborhood," so religious man can by his cooperation in a practical program make the world into "one brotherhood."

The Congress will seek to create a world-wide sentiment in behalf of the things for which vital religion stands. Its universality should make this program appealing beyond anything that has been attempted.

The delegates will be asked to accept the following four points as basic to the purpose and the program of the Congress:

1. A belief in a Supreme Being.
2. A desire for fellowship, understanding, and the practice of human brotherhood.
3. Cooperation to help secure international justice, promote good will, and provide for all men everywhere the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
4. Acceptance of the over-all purpose of the Congress to unite men and women of all religious faiths in support of the United Nations.

We realize fully the difficulty the Congress will face in its endeavor to agree upon a common program. With high idealism, however, we shall achieve effective action.

1. The Congress will ask what each religion can contribute. How can the adherents of the religions effectively support the United Nations and its constituent agencies?
2. The World Congress will be a conference of individuals associated with, but not committing, the organized bodies of the different faiths. No one will be encouraged to boast either of the past or of the superiority of his particular faith. The Congress will not be used by any secular or religious group for self-advancement.
3. The Congress will not attempt to establish a formal league of religions; questions relating to doctrine, dogmas, and forms of faith and worship will not be discussed.

In brief, *the Congress will consider how the forces of religion in all nations can be mobilized into a concerted action in support of the United Nations and its efforts to establish a peaceful, friendly world.*

Principles for Civilization

RANDALL S. HILTON

Hiroshima is the symbol of man's creative ability and power to destroy himself and the evidence of his willingness to do so. This suicidal mania which is being augmented by talk of a third World War and a social hysteria created by conflicting totalitarianisms should give to sane men cause to pause and think. For the specialized and unspecialized, the skilled and unskilled, the primary question today is whether we can achieve civilization before extinction. That culture we so glibly called Western civilization has been given the lie.

The era through which we have just passed was an advanced age in machines, gadgets, and development in certain limited fields. But in the area of the fundamental problems of human relations there has been little progress since the days of Athens and Rome. Our forms of slavery are different, but nonetheless stultifying to personality. Our bread and circuses are not so obvious, but are equally inadequate and frustrating. If "to civilize" means to come out of savagery and barbarity, then this is a task still to be accomplished.

Charles B. Hilton, a Baptist minister in Central Illinois, wrote these lines which he called "No Laughing Matter."

Oliver Wendell once could smile
As an old man passed the while,
Feeble, doddering, hand on cane
Ambling down a sheltered lane.

For if he should live to be
The last leaf upon the tree
At his journey's end he'd find
Friendly smiles and glances kind.

Wendell talked in mild derision
Knowing naught of nuclear fission,
Wendell walked with poise and calm
For he feared no atom bomb.

Living now a genial wit
Scarcely dares to handle it,
As his fancy seeks to probe
The grim future of our globe.

Grasping, hoping, he may find
Confidence and peace of mind
Seeking God's design displayed
In this chaos man has made.

In this man-made chaos we have called Western civilization, man has increased his productive ability by technological inventions. He now has the power to satisfy his basic needs. He has also greatly enhanced his leisure time. However, little inventive genius has been demonstrated in the ways of using that leisure.

Through the press and the radio it is now possible to speak to the entire world almost simultaneously. But we have little, if anything, new to say and no common language in which to say it. It is possible for man to travel, to visit many other peoples, with ease, speed and comfort. But how much of it is done for the purpose of increasing understanding and appreciation? Instruments of great power and of potential good have been created, but we have allowed them to be used for the destruction of society. Great knowledge and skill have been acquired in medicine and surgery, both curative and preventative, but we have not brought its benefits to the masses of the people.

We have sold ourselves on the values of freedom and democracy and yet we begrudge using our spare time for civic activities. We have been imbued with the scientific concept of law and order but insist that society and its legislation should operate to our personal advantage. How else can we account for the power and resources of the numerous lobbies or the overwhelming opposition to the establishment of research laboratories and commissions for discovering the principles for just and harmonious codes of conduct?

Fundamentally, we know that religious principles are challenging and disturbing, and demand change. Nevertheless, most people prefer their religious institutions to provide them with an opiate of peaceful consolation, stimulating their dreaming in blissful complacency. All great religious leaders, genuine prophets, and true philosophers have emphasized the necessity of self-knowledge, self-discipline, understanding and cooperation. But we of the Western World have deliberately chosen to follow the Machiavelian gospel of power and the economic determinism of Karl Marx. We may reject their conclusions and goals, but we follow their gospels under more appealing names.

Is it any wonder we live in a world of unprecedented achievement and unprecedented chaos?

Not so long ago I listened to one of the atomic scientists read a paper to a small group of men. He sounded much like a liberal preacher. Here was a man who for years followed the research scientist's philosophy of the ivory tower laboratory. What the people did with the discoveries of the pure scientist was their business, not his. But now he had joined with other scientists to bring home to the people of America and the world the joint responsibility for the control of atomic energy. Here was a change of attitude, a change in way of living, which amounted to a conversion. It was a frank recognition that man is responsible for his own destiny.

The recognition of man's responsibility for his own destiny is the first principle for the achieving of civilization. This requires that we junk the feelings of self-satisfaction and complacency that permeate our society. We must expand as rapidly as possible our capacity for production, not only in technology and professional skills, but, more important, in the arts of cooperation and human relations. Much more of our leisure time must be devoted to those religious and civic activities which will make possible the enjoyment of freedom and the practice of democracy. Government is more im-

portant than golf, ballots than bridge. It should not be asking too much of a citizen to devote as much time to perfecting his government as to perfecting his game. Certainly this need on the local, national and world scale is obvious.

We must demand and secure the services of legislators, administrators, and judges, who are not subservient to special interests but devoted to the common welfare of mankind. This can be done if each of us recognizes man's responsibility for his own destiny and our individual part in it.

The second principle for the achieving of civilization is faith in man. Too long our faith has been placed in some particular man, some group of men, an elect or an elite. At various stages in history it has been the clergy, educators, scientists, or the leaders of a particular political party. It is imperative now that our faith must be in the abilities and capacities of all men, the common man.

The new civilization cannot be built upon an elite, no matter how sure we are or how sure they are of their infallibility. Persons with special skills or abilities are not different in kind. An expert is only a man with a special contribution to make to our common life. He is not set apart from or above the rest of men, rather he has only increased his responsibility to share his skills and to cooperate with his fellow men.

Further, if we are to protect ourselves against outbreaks of emotionalism and irrationality, against mental and moral irresponsibility, we must widen the base for participation in fundamental decisions. The fewer persons involved in making these decisions, the greater the potential of error and the greater the temptation to power. "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." The power regulating and controlling human life must be diversified and spread over all the people.

If we would prevent the concentration of power in the hands of a few, whether it be in Wall Street or Washington, the Vatican or Moscow, we must achieve this diffusion of power and overcome our own temptations to tyranny. We do not have to tyrannize those whom we trust. Thus the necessity of faith in man to civilization.

The third principle for the achieving of civilization is the greatest good for all men. It should be obvious by this time that the old shibboleth of "the greatest good for the greatest number" has led us down a blind alley into confusion and chaos. This concept has served its purpose. It helped a few areas of the world to change the method of making decisions from bullets to ballots. However, it has left the problems of ethics and morality in a complete state of flux. It provided no standard by which we could determine even their relativity to the common welfare of mankind.

"The greatest good for the greatest number" justifies the British policy in Palestine, the American policy in the Pacific, and the Russian policy in the Balkans. But whether the greatest good for all men justifies all or any of these policies is another question.

The greatest good for all men requires a reorientation of our approach to economics, politics, education, religion, and even to science and technology. With this principle these phases of life, and all others, will find their motivation and satisfaction not in personal profit, power or prestige, but in service, in raising the level of living, in the increased dignity of men. It quite likely will require an increased specialization of individual abilities and skills. At the same time, however, there will be a demand for, and the necessity of, universalizing opportunities and applications.

These, then, are the principles for civilization:

1. The recognition of man's responsibility for his own destiny.
2. Faith in our fellow men.
3. The greatest good for all.

Upon these, and the ethics and morality growing out of them, can be built a new civilization which will rise like the phoenix bird from the ashes of the one we have destroyed.

Niebuhr and the Three Bears

R. LESTER MONDALE

The Neo-orthodox viewpoint can be seen for what it is only in a sociological perspective. Sociologically, ideologically, it represents an Americanized counterpart of the Continental, and to no small extent Barthian, reaffirmations of escapist and obscurantist forms of Christianity.

The Continental reaffirmations in point were the response of the middle classes to the oncoming social revolution with its inevitable doom for their status and sense of destiny. The bourgeoisie of Central Europe in particular found themselves confronted with the revolt of the masses, the collectivizing and, to them, immoral, unprincipled ideology which seem everywhere to accompany their rise. The revolution thus spelled infinitely more than economic and political change. The nearer its approach, the more poignantly men felt the agonizing truth of Trotsky's dictum: "Revolution destroys men." Faced with the spiritual destruction that accompanied deprivation of status and of their sense of manifest destiny the classes were in a situation similar to that of the person confronted with the facts of personal failure and inferiority. This horrific truth the individual seldom has the courage to admit to himself—and a class, never. Like the individual, classes met the inexorable peril with labyrinthine rationalizations which, in the field of religion, tended to dissolve familiar reality into its ever-present background of mystery to the point where a world more congenial to the individual's wishes became progressively less fantastic, even to the degree of becoming reality itself. With the onset of this frantic state of mind, traditional Biblical as well as Papal authority took on a renewed value and sanctity—for in divine revelation did not the jittery soul find for his sustaining rationalizations the assuring confirmation of the Ultimate?

It is in this perspective that the Continental damnation of liberalism becomes understandable. In liberalism the bourgeois personality, confronted literally with Trotskian disintegration, found no reassurances—only the skepticism that had undermined the faith of his fathers, the debunking and theorizing that had shaken the foundations of his trust in finance capitalism. Liberalism, moreover, had for him the Communist and

Socialist taint—for all its unpopularity among those doctrinaires of revolution. So neither in religion nor in politics did liberalism hold any solace for the sinking bourgeois grasping at straws.

A parenthetical paragraph having to do with the genesis of the writer's own liberalism is in order here: This personal history goes back some twenty years to a profound disillusionment with what was then passing as liberalism. First in the order of revolt came a thoroughgoing rejection of the then Pollyanna "healthy mindedness" of liberal theism. It had no satisfactory answer to the tragic aspects of personal and collective existence, as well as to the inescapable mystery of surrounding infinitude. Indeed, it is highly questionable if its gladsome proponents were even aware of tragedy and mystery. The personal revolt spread rapidly to take in "progress onward and upward forever" reformism, then to include the patent inadequacy of "social service" and "social justice" administered by do-gooders and pinkish advocates of a "nice" revolution. But most disturbing was religious liberalism's lack of positive religious content. Mere moralism spelled mere boredom; conventional worship, sheer antiquarianism. That this revolt may well have had its roots in the sense of personal inadequacy common among bourgeois minds confronted by impending revolutionary change, is entirely possible and probable. Here, however, the parallels cease. About the time the revolt approached that climax in which the individual realizes that although he cannot fathom the infinite he must come to some kind of working agreement with ever-present and unsettling infinitude, the writer discovered that at the heart of his revolt was a rebirth and reincarnation of the old liberal spirit . . . that in a reborn liberal spirit alone—rather than in any temporarily consoling and retrograde dogmatism—lay the hope of achieving a realistic and possibly inspiring relationship with the infinite and, ultimately, of peace on earth and good will among men. Hence the writer's profound distaste for Neo-orthodoxy's cavalier dismissal of liberalism, and its all-too-successful attempt to reinstate revealed religion with its dogmatic frame of mind in a world already suffering from the agonies of death from tragic excess of that kind of thing.

Neo-orthodoxy, in all probability, will never in itself become a mass movement. But its mass influence is more than likely to prove incalculably powerful in so far as it offers the sorry spectacle of men who supposedly rank high in the academic world renouncing liberalism and returning to various of the central dogmas of orthodox Christianity. They thus give the green light to every form of blind faith and fanaticism, making it possible for religious demagogues to proceed without fear of the pale cast of liberal thought and doubt. Thus does Neo-orthodoxy cross-fertilize with rampant Fundamentalism and its companion weed, Fascism.

The reeling Continental bourgeois steadied himself on the one hand with obscurantist forms of Christianity, and, on the other, with Fascism and Nazism. These became his refuges against the impending uprooting of middle-class humanity. Thus religious and political reaction were in essence son and daughter, brother and sister, of the times.

All this was far from apparent on the American scene. It seemed to Americans that Fascism, once it had wrenched itself loose from the hands of British and American imperialists, was *the* revolution. Frightened bourgeois New Worlders failed to see it for what it was in reality—the epitome of bourgeois exploitation, ruthlessness, militarism, and imperialistic racism. So little had the revolt of the masses progressed on New World soil that the Axis and allied systems appeared to be the most vicious possible threat to freedom, democracy, and Christianity. Panic hit academic and intellectual circles generally, and quickly spread to the religious and even to the commercial. The bourgeois American's head swam. In spiritual desperation he put one hand on that which is variously called Neo-orthodoxy, and Fundamentalism, and the other on the war (which gave his class a refreshed sense of destiny) to destroy Hitlerism. Thus in America religious reaction came out of the fear of the middle classes of what in Europe was in its turn the middle-class reaction to the real revolt of the masses. This revolt in turn harked back to the difficulties that the old order was experiencing in adjusting itself to the new principle, basic in national and international life, that mass production must have mass consumption. Hence it is that today, despite the destruction of Hitler, the hanging of his lieutenants, and the punitive reduction of Germany to a less than subsistence level of living, middle-class America is awakening, outraged and panicky, to find itself less secure than before the war. The revolution is still with us. It will be with us until we have found some way to match mass production with mass consumption. Nothing, furthermore, would so hurry on a truly catastrophic uprooting of American humanity as a war, even if ultimately victorious, on that union of countries which appears to be the embodiment of revolution only because impending change there has been most marked.

In the foregoing counter-revolutionary and revolutionary setting Reinhold Niebuhr's *Discerning the Signs of These Times* appears somewhat differently from what it does to those who see in it satisfaction for a personal need for its particular "ideological taint." Even the rich, as Niebuhr envisions social change, will be with us a good long time: "The strength to bring forth a more just social order depends partly upon the ability of the poor to transmute their resentments into genuine instruments of justice; and partly upon the ability of the rich to moderate the stupidity of sinful pride and arrogant defiance of the inevitable." Those finding consolation in these pages will insist rationally and irrationally that here is a work of prophetic, philosophical, and scholarly talent or even genius, with profound insights, prophetic oracles, inspirational meat—done apparently with incisiveness, comprehension, and compelling logic. The writer, doubtless because of his ardently liberal predisposition and slant on signs and times, dissents. Here, essentially, is merely a refuge, and a flimsy refuge at that, for those who are unwilling or who are incapable of humbling themselves to make the sacrifice of meeting the future with a liberal spirit—a house, in other words, for the doomed and despairing, built on sand.

The dominating spirit of the book, as its theological bias would lead one to expect, is illiberal and dogmatic. This also was the case with Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* There one reads, in a paragraph about Karen Horney and the psychologists, the judgment of the dogmatist: "But the *truth is* that man's. . ." (P. 192.) Again, (p. 201), he smiles upon Protestantism from his pontifical throne: "Protestantism is *right* in insisting. . ." Again, (p. 220), "The-

ologies, such as that of Barth . . . are *rightly* suspected. . ." And yet again, (p. 240), he speaks with the untrammeled assurance of the dogmatist: ". . . sensuality is *always*. . ."—going on to list the three things it *always* is. Turning to his recent book we find this vast pronouncement, "the Enlightenment reduced everything to shallowness." (P. 107.) One can all but hear the plaudits of the illiberal disciple. However, one wonders if the same beaming sycophant might not squirm uncomfortably when he finds: "The sense of a divine judgment beyond all human judgments is *rightly* apprehended by St. Paul as. . ." (P. 17.) Here the expositor of Biblical revelation elevates himself to an eminence that comes impiously close to making the revealing Trinity into a Quadrinity, with himself as Holy Four.

The spirit of dogmatism, thus invoked, proceeds throughout the work to turn into pious sophistry what might have become incisiveness, comprehension, and compelling logic, if his had been a truly liberal outlook. Dogmatist, the author invariably knows beforehand and regardless of possibilities to the contrary, what his conclusion must be; and the conclusion is one in stripe with "Thus sayeth the Lord." More specifically, a trip through any one of Niebuhr's books puts one in mind of nothing so much as the excursion of Goldilocks. Her trying of the chairs, soups, and beds in the home of the three bears is Niebuhr in the modern world of thought. He sits in papa bear's philosophy, (p. 172), which finds revelation meaningless; he tries mama bear's "merely poetic appreciations of mystery." But the one that just fits is, as always: "The Christian faith is the *right* expression of the greatness and weakness of man in relation to the mystery and meaning of life." Wherever the reader turns in Niebuhr's writings he finds himself listening to a cumbersome rehashing of the old kindergarten tale. There is always a bed that is too long and one that is too short, and the inevitable Niebuhrian Christian bed that is perfection incarnate.

In making out his case against everything not orthodox or Neo-orthodox the author writes without scruple. History becomes the mystery which, of course, it is in reality. But the historical conceptions of bourgeois liberalism are too soft; those of Marxist utopianism too hard. They are the philosophies of hypocritical man; and the self-interests of hypocritical man weight his interpretations of the signs of the times. Having thus disposed of the equipment of two of the bears he proceeds, like the teller of thrice-told tales, to the unsurprising *discovery* that through Christianity we can discern the signs of the times.

> . . . the mystery of history can not be resolved except in the divine mercy. And that mercy can be comprehended and apprehended by those who acknowledge that all classes and groups, all cultures and nations, are tainted with hypocrisy in their judgment of the contestants in and of the whole drama of history. The wisdom by which we deal with our fellow men, either as comrades or competitors, is not so much an intellectual achievement as the fruit of a humility which is gained through prayer. (P. 20.) [Elsewhere he adds]: The only moments in which the self-righteousness is broken are moments of genuine prayer.

Granted that history is mysterious and granted that bourgeois liberalism and Marxism have erred in their discernments, granted also that a keener awareness of our Pareto-like egoistic concealment of what we see would help in getting the signs aright—even so, the gentle reader remains standing, finger on lip before the vast residual unknowns of history. What is this *genuine* kind of prayer that corrects self-righteousness? Among what groups of Christians does one find it? How does it stand in contradistinction to the mood of the Roundhead just off his knees. Or the anti-Russian hatred of the Roman Catholic fresh from adoring his Blessed Sacrament? But to get closer to the heart of the matter: What assurance have we that we could actually discern the signs of these times even if we were not hypocrites? Would the mystery of history actually be resolved by one enveloped in divine mercy? Or is there a marked residuum of mystery that remains veiled even to the saints? The impression one gets from reading history is that the sinners ordinarily have read the signs more accurately than the saints. The saints may have shouted judgment and woe, which ultimately eventuated in any case; but the sinners seem almost without interruption to have made the money, enjoyed the milk and honey, and held the reins of power. Indeed, one might very well ponder the thought that accurate discernment of the signs may also require a certain minimum taint of sin!

The author proceeds to read his discernment of the signs into the "Nemesis of Nations." Nations, like individuals, try to make themselves stronger than they have a right to be, pretend in the same manner to be exaltedly wise. They defy God and reap "divine condemnation." Thus in one week in 1945 "one dictator died an obscene death for an obscenely ambitious life; and another died in the violence which his life had breathed." God had acted, using other nations who were sinful but "still good enough to be executors of divine judgment." Here again the gentle reader stands pondering, finger on lip, thinking possibly of the many divine judgments on Judea. Did Judea suffer so much from pretensions to power and wisdom as from the geographical fact of being located on an important Continental highway that bridged the territories of northern empires with the southern? How come pillaging Rome's millenium of prosperity and power? How come, again, the persistence of "perfidious Albion" with its Kiplingesque master race? Did Latvia and Estonia go down again and again because of divine judgment—or, for that matter, Scotland, Wales, and, across the Channel, Burgundy and Avignon? May it not be that the claim to understand the ins and outs of divine judgment on nations is again a function of Quadrinity?

This gives rise to a further consideration: Upon what basis can the author condemn that evil of all evils, war, as long as nations can continue on a Niebuhrian basis to pose as instruments of divine judgment? This position is fraught with evil and peril, for seldom, if ever, has any nation not regarded itself as an instrument of divine judgment: witness recent appeals to Amaterasu and the Urville! It is a highly questionable proposition that there ever will be a victor, on the other hand, which will repent and be humble, Niebuhr fashion. And so we have but the dismal prospect, viewed by way of Niebuhrian discernments, of holy wars continuing down the centuries, possibly to the very end of time. The most disturbing conclusion one is forced to draw from the author's position is that it aids and abets the sordid business of the military. If bourgeois America becomes Fascist in the process of building a middle-class corporation at home, of destroying Communism abroad, and of extending nationalistic exploitation, it will be done, without doubt, under the pious guise of bringing divine judgment on errant

nations and classes. We will be sinful, of course, but never too sinful to be the sword of the Lord. Thus the invoking of the divine, especially when the invocation is backed by the assurance of revelation, opens the doors to unreason, with fanaticism and its vicious train of callousness and cruelty and enduring hatreds.

The following chapter by chapter too-hard of papa bear, too-soft of mama bear, and the just-right of little baby bear is no more convincing than in the sections on the Signs themselves and on the Nemesis of Nations. In the "Age Between the Ages" we run into the fantastic mama-bear statement in regard to the "liberal culture of the past two centuries": "Its faith grew out of an age of easy achievements and few frustrations." (P. 54.) Upon what new and revolutionary historical evidence does Niebuhr find that the rise of liberalism in its early bourgeois forms and the overthrow of feudalism was *easy?* Even with regard to the American scene one finds it difficult to apply the word *easy* to the achievements of democratic liberalism from Daniel Shay to Andrew Jackson. Again Niebuhr indulges in this mama-bear enormity of intellectual justice: "The irreligious resolve the problems of human existence and the mystery of the created world into systems of easily ascertained meaning." (P. 153.) In another place he has science play a typically unconvincing papa-bear role: "The age of science traced the relations of the world of nature, studied the various causes which seemed to be at the root of various effects in every realm of natural coherence; and came to the conclusion that knowledge dissolved mystery." (P. 158.) It is highly problematical if Herbert Spencer himself could have taken the aroma of that statement with equanimity. But the real denouement comes when he finds the *just right* of getting at truth in Christian "religious humility which gains awareness of the unconscious dishonesty of judgment and seeks to correct it." The author's theory here would be sound were it not for the practical fact that the framework the *humble* Christian mind has exhibited throughout Christian history has displayed such a marked bent for preferring dogma to truth. "Objectivity" rightly calls for humility, but does it call for the peculiar humility of a Neo-orthodox frame of mind, or for a certain quality, not as yet entirely explicated, in the scientific and scholarly method?

The three bears method has this defect—that eventually it brings the author face to face with the bears themselves; not only with mama and papa bear but more particularly with the cub as well. It is not at all unlikely that one day the golden haired Neo-orthodoxer may be awakened by the growls of the little baby bear. Thus the question that continually pops into the mind of the critical reader of this book, as well as of others by the same author, as to just how orthodox and Christian Niebuhrianism is. May it not be that a more accurate characterization is "half way orthodoxy" rather than "Neo-orthodoxy"? It is far from easy to see how his explicated Trinity and Atonement, even his pick-and-choose handling of Biblical revelation could be acceptable to the genuinely orthodox Christian. Even sin partakes here of a distinctly Neibuhrian rather than positively Christian note. Sin here harks back not to some depravity, some defect in man's essence, but to the fact that he is great as well as small, "free and bound," "limited and limitless." This pre-condition, the author insists (*The Nature and Destiny of Man,* p. 178), offers the occasion for sin but is not in itself the cause. He is sure that this pre-condition is not the inexorable cause of sin because "according to Biblical faith, there is no absolute necessity that man should be betrayed into sin by the ambiguity of his position. . ." Having thus invoked revelation and theoretically put the blame for sin upon man himself, the author goes on (p. 182) to say that anxiety, which is the "internal precondition of sin" is "the inevitable concomitant of the paradox of freedom and finiteness in which man is involved." Everywhere we run into this same theme, the inevitability of sin. The resultant effect on the reader is simply that Niebuhrian sin, far from being the loathsome and abhorrent corruption fought by traditional Christian saint and evangelist and layman, is more reminiscent of the fatal flaw and tragic involvement of the Hellenic tragic hero. It is the inescapable and unavoidable failure of a person of essentially high stature. And the way out would seem to call more for an Aeschylean purgation of emotion than for the typically Christian contrition that Niebuhr would reinstate universally by his theological *tour de force.*

The author's halfway orthodoxy, far from being even an approximation to the typical Christian theological system, with a definite beginning, middle and end, is in essence merely an arbitrarily and temporarily convenient selection of those elements in historic Christianity which seem to give spiritual support to the cherished hopes and attitudes of the uneasy bourgeois. All this becomes more apparent as the counter-revolution approaches its hour of nemesis, as has recently transpired so catastrophically in Central Europe, and the real revolt of the masses impends heavily on the hour. Then, with men face to face with destruction, halfway orthodoxy goes into the discard, and only out-and-out, heaven-bent medievalism fills the desperate spiritual bill. Certain present trends in Europe, the writer is informed, make Barth and Brunner look like liberals

The essential folly of halfway orthodoxy stands out when one scans its broadest outlines. Anxious man, anxious inevitably because of his anomalous nature and position in the universe, doomed to suffer unremittingly from personal insecurity and social frustration has before him always the possibility that "faith in the ultimate security of God's love would overcome all immediate insecurities of nature and history." Although this is the ideal it is not even approximated by the saints, we are informed. Yet it is the ideal nevertheless, the goal in a sense of all religious striving, and the aim of immortality. Suppose, however, that the goal were achieved, that terrestrial man had overcome his anxiety, that he no longer was the restless and frustrated Niebuhrian devil coursing to and fro across the earth, writing books of theological controversy, building buildings, constructing empires—if in perfect trust he found perfect repose in the power that tends the lilies—would this spell the ultimate in animalish contentment, innocuous mystic absorption? Was this the trust practiced so disastrously by the Nazarenes of the early chapters of Acts? The author's anxiety-cure is patently a terrestrial anomaly.

Answer will be made that the ultimate goal must be viewed in a perspective of eternity. But even as a heavenly prospect it lacks lure and enchantment; for are not even the angels less than God?—and if so, on Niebuhrian premises, how can they be exempt from the sins characteristic of the *homo sapiens?* And if so, by what kind of miracle is man transformed in a trice

upon death for contentment and peace in heaven—when it was apparently not within the power of the First Cause to make him thus and so upon his entrance to the seven stages of his earthly tragedy? Turning to the Bible we find the corollaries of Niebuhrian gloom confirmed. It seems that angels actually have fallen from heaven from time to time. It seems probable also that hell is manned by these fallen misanthropes of the spirit. Hence if angels fell once long ago, what assurance has man that they might not be falling still? Moreover, if the human spirit is constructed according to the charts of the Niebuhrian laboratory, then surely the spirit of man does face long aeons of unrelieved Neo-orthodox frustration and gloom with very much punctuated ups and downs!

The outstanding note of the book is gloom and despair, relieved primarily by the comfortless goals of the preceding paragraphs. Nations which merely compound and mountain individual egotism have no recourse but "fleeing the wrath which is to come." Sharp, if not bloody, conflict between nations and classes is to be our lot for ages to come. Anything approximating "political instruments and moral resources adequate for a wholesale communal life on a world-wide scale" will come only after the passing of generations, centuries. One occasional and momentary relief he holds out: If the Almighty visits us with sufficient punishment to keep us humble, chastened and repentant like the child (in the hands of the grim Puritan father) who enjoys the relief that follows emotional conflict, whipping, and reconciliation. Lastly, if we are assiduous in avoiding the hard bed of the peace of nature, and the too-soft bed of the peace of human reason, we might find ourselves in the author's just-right Peace of God.

We learn—when we have lifted the seven veils of Niebuhrian obscurity having to do with things that "lie beyond understanding," the profundities of forgiving, etc.,—that peace is equated with the higher reaches of social orientation:

> The servants of the needy who embody the various ministries of mercy, doctors and visiting nurses, social workers and champions of social justice, pastors and all other ministers of need cannot have the peace which Epictetus sought after. They become too deeply involved in the suffering to which they minister. Yet the most sensitive spirits of every age have rightly sought after such vocations and found happiness in them. They have experienced the joys which are "three parts pain"; and have touched the fringes of the mystery of the peace of God. (P. 186.)

Even here, he insists, there will also be a taint of selfishness and sin which calls in turn for repeated or continuous repentance and the forgiveness of divine grace. Thus the moralistic social orientation, which is the highest level of Niebuhr's spiritual climbing, is made complete.

That the ministers of mercy—and we would include also many outgoing personalities in the arts—achieve something that might be termed the Peace of God, is beyond question. But that Niebuhr should stop here betrays, as nothing else could, the inadequacy of his spiritual development. In more essentially Christian and Catholic terms he shows every evidence of standing in need of a good first-rate religious rebirth. In Christian experience there has been a distinct trace of reality in what men have called "cleansing from sin." There has been and is a state of salvation in which the dominant note is not gloom and anticipation of punishment, but "solemn joy," in which action is posited on the Biblical principle of overcoming evil with good, in which one looks on all things with "eyes of love." In non-Christian terms Niebuhr's shortcoming lies to no small degree in his inadequate understanding of the nature of the self. He has yet to discover, for all his philosophizing about the self in *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* that salvation extends far beyond the spirituality of personality-integration through social orientation; also that salvation by way of the finding of the self as is suggested in Emerson's *Oversoul,* or even in the *Upanishads,* is not mere poetry or mystical effacement of self. In the light of a larger spirituality the medieval Christianity of the Cross is superseded by the Christianity of Jesus and his own symbol of perfection: one must be perfect like God whose perfection we are to think of in terms of the sun, shedding light and warmth unstintingly upon evil and good.

Only personalities that are thus integrated have the stamina to resist the disintegrations of revolution, and the detachment from class and convention to resist excess with a high degree of impersonality and to cooperate with what is good. And it should go almost without saying that one can participate in that kind of salvation—which, of course, is not a momentary illumination, but a life-long process—only when guided and inspired by a spirit sufficiently humbled in mind to dare to discard such vaulting pretensions to knowledge and understanding as Niebuhr's revealer-God wrecking his divine judgment on nations, and face the Unknown, and face it until the mystery of the Boundless becomes the sublimity of the Infinite. And that spirit is the venerable, always-being-reincarnated spirit of the liberal mind and soul.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 42)

Asserting that the Amnesty Committee is campaigning to free political prisoners, its secretary, Albon Man, pointed out that a permanent class of political prisoners would be created under the plan recently advanced by the President's Commission on Universal Training.

In a letter to Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the Commission, Mr. Man quoted from the section of the Commission's report regarding conscientious objectors and others who would refuse to take part in the proposed compulsory military training program: "Granting the sincerity of those who take this extreme position, they may not reasonably seek exemption from the penalty the law may impose." This statement was, Mr. Man said, a "candid recognition" of the fact that peacetime conscription would give rise to a regular category of political offenders.

"We should regard that development as a most unfortunate departure from our American traditions of religious and political freedom," Mr. Man wrote. He contrasted the Commission's report with the numerous amnesty appeals to President Truman from prominent organizations and individuals in all areas of national life.

The Study Table

Cultural Heritage

THE NOBLE VOICE. A Study of Ten Great Poems. *By Mark Van Doren. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 328 pp. $3.00.*

It is the author's purpose to provide the reader with a critical analysis of the ten great poems he has chosen. In his analysis of these poems he also attempts to show how they are related to each other. He has chosen these poems because it is his belief that they represent poetry at its best. His criticism or analysis of these poems, however, is not written in the highly technical language of the specialist. It is, rather, designed to help the average reader analyze and understand these great works of our cultural heritage.

The ten great poems chosen by Mr. Van Doren are the Iliad and Odyssey, The Aeneid, Paradise Lost, Concerning the Nature of Things, The Divine Comedy, The Faerie Queene, Troilus and Criseyde, Don Juan, and the Prelude. What the specialists in poetry, especially those who have specialized in these particular poems, will have to say remains to be seen. However, it is safe to say that if Mr. Average Man really reads this book he will have a much more intimate and detailed analysis of these works than he ever had before. It is the author's hope that this book will stimulate wider and more frequent reading of these great poems. Undoubtedly a careful reading of them will add considerably to our cultural background, and no person can be said to have a truly liberal education unless he has read these great poems understandingly. The question that comes to mind as one thinks of what it requires to read this book *and* the originals (which is what this book is supposed to inspire us to do) is this: How many of us have the leisure, or feel they can afford to take it, to read this book and the originals? I believe the answer is: Not very many! This unfortunate state of affairs may be more of a commentary upon our modern society than upon Mr. Van Doren's work. I expect, therefore, that this book will have a very limited appeal.

And as I read it, the question kept coming to mind: How much will familiarity with this book and the originals help us to understand the issues of our own day? Maybe the great books are not supposed to, but some of their proponents insist that that is their value; they help us to interpret our times. Yet I did not feel that I gained a deeper or more fundamental understanding of the issues of the Year 2 Atomic Age by reading Mr. Van Doren's analysis of these ten great poems. And I doubt very much if we can achieve the insights, the wisdom, the help we need for living wisely and courageously in an Atomic Age from material that is the product of radically different ages. By this I do not mean that we must discard our heritage from past cultures or that these ten great poems have nothing to offer us for an Atomic Age. But right now it seems to me we can spend our time to better advantage in an analysis of the literature that interprets the Atomic Age to us. Perhaps it is too early for poetry to do so. Perhaps, though, our understanding of this age would be enhanced if poets devote their imaginative faculties to this new world we will have to live in.

KENNETH C. WALKER.

Record of Social Work

SOCIAL WORK YEAR BOOK—1947. *Russell H. Kurtz, Editor. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 714 pp. $3.50.*

Like the eight preceding issues, this is a comprehensive and competent record of organized activities in the area of social work and related fields in the United States. Also there are articles on Canadian Social Work, Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, and International Social Work. There is an excellent directory of national and international agencies in the field. As with each previous issue of the *Social Work Year Book,* this ninth edition is complete in itself and may be used without reference to previous editions. For social workers, social scientists, and socially-minded editors, legislators, and students of social welfare, the *Social Work Year Book* is indispensable. It is encyclopedic and authoritative. And there is a good index.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Story of a Full Life

FABRIC OF MY LIFE. *By Hannah G. Solomon. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. 263 pp. $2.50.*

Chicagoans in particular will be interested in this book, written by a women in her eighties, a woman born and reared in Chicago. They will see their city through the eyes of one for whom this city had a special point of view. Mrs. Solomon, born Hannah Greenebaum, was one of ten children, whose parents came from Germany about a hundred years ago. This book is a delightful combination of the history of our city and the history of a large and remarkable Jewish family.

Apart from the *achievements* of the clan of Greenebaum, it is a rewarding experience to learn of so happy a group, of such devoted brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles, nephews and nieces. And Mrs. Solomon's relationship to her own children and grandchildren is charmingly recounted. If I had not known many members of this vast galaxy it might seem an unbelievable story; but, no, the devotion has been there, the family ties, the happy marriages, the loyalties, the good times that gave its members strength and a sense of security.

Mrs. Solomon's life, however, was much more than that of a homemaker. She was identified with the growth of the city in a cultural and philanthropic sense. Joining the Chicago Woman's Club as a young woman she participated with its members in many of the humanitarian undertakings that were carried through to successful and permanent conclusions,—in the courts, in the schools, in the charities. I particularly recall the founding of the Park Ridge Home for Girls. What is now the flourishing Legal Aid Department of the Jewish Charities got off to its initial start through the enterprise of Mrs. Solomon and interested friends.

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of this long life, which closed before the book was published, was the founding of the National Council of Jewish Women. The story of Mrs. Solomon's life in relation to it is an exciting and rewarding one. Starting as the result of the Great Congress of Religions which met at the Art Institute during the Fair of 1893, it grew through the years to national and international proportions, and its

work took its founder on extensive and inspiring trips abroad as well as back and forth across our country. "Faith and Humanity" were and still are the watchwords of the Council. They appear often throughout the record and describe as of today the Council's interest in things Jewish, in the faith of the fathers, as well as in things that benefit mankind as a whole. Its greatest achievement, however, was in saving many of the Jewish people of Germany during the Hitler era, rescuing them from that savage land, rehabilitating them here among people of kindness and understanding.

Mrs. Solomon enumerates four great events in Chicago's history. The Fort Dearborn Massacre, the Chicago Fire of 1871 which she experienced, the beautiful World's Columbian Exposition of 1893, and the Century of Progress Fair of 1933. Yes, important events, but is it not interesting that a person challenged by the problem and fact of anti-Semitism, seeing the need of members of the minority group to band together to fight prejudice and oppression, does not see beyond this problem, does not see it in its relation to the world problem, the Fascist problem? I like to believe that had Mrs. Solomon and her dear ones not been surrounded by economic security the problem of the Jew in America and anti-Semitism abroad would have been seen as symptoms of the same disease as that which produced the Haymarket riots of 1886, and that this disturbing event with its world-shaking and ever-recurrent significance would have been enumerated along with the others in Chicago's memorabilia. This was the shot heard round the world even more than that at Concord. Chicago gave May Day to the world. Today, in 1947, people are either proud or angry about this fact. When we see this Fascist drive which embraces not only labor-baiting, Red-baiting, baiting of the foreign-born, and Negro-baiting, but Jew-baiting as well, it is evident that we must go farther than do such groups as the Council of Jewish Women and unite against the reactionary drive of Fascism and empire all the democratic elements in our society, all the fighters for the people's cause, for the little people everywhere.

There are two kinds of nationalism—the one which unites a people to throw off the yoke of oppression, and the one, which, like Hitler's brand, unites a people to commit aggression. Perhaps we can say that Mrs. Solomon in her work exemplified the first kind of nationalism that helped to unite her people, but it is good to be able to say also that in the next generation of Greenebaum, among the children of Mrs. Solomon and her brothers and sisters, we find here in Chicago people at work in the overall democratic cause, against lynching, against the poll tax, against all kinds of exploitation and discrimination, and for a state and Federal F.E.P.C.

DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE.

America Must Lead

THE NOTHINGNESS OF WAR. *By Albert P. Cage. Chicago: A. P. Cage. 133 pp. $2.00.*

This book by a veteran deals with the basic causes of war. It is a strong call for a world in which there will be no more war forever. The objective of this book is to inculcate the ideals of peace into as many hearts and minds as possible.

Mr. Cage is certain that America must be the leader in any movement for world peace. "I believe she is in a better position and has grander leaders to lead this movement than any other country in the world."

He cites the enormous cost of war and begs the nations, especially our nation, to put this vast amount into the things that make for peace. Every book that causes people to stop and think about the cost of war is worthwhile.

JAMES M. YARD.

Growth

As man once worshipped many gods
And now but one,
So shall the nations learn and merge
Into but one.

LEE SPENCER.

Correspondence

The Community Church of New York

TO UNITY:

I am sure that most of your readers know of The Community Church of New York which unites all kinds and conditions of men, including Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, Hindus, Negroes, whites, Orientals, rich, and poor. They know its minister, John Haynes Holmes, and his unceasing labors in behalf of social justice, brotherhood, good will, and world peace. I wonder if they know that The Community Church lost its building seventeen years ago and that it is just now building a new house of worship and community service center on 35th Street off Park Avenue in New York City. Its hard-pressed people have given more than $200,000.00 for this project, and yet $60,000.00 must be raised from outside friends by next November if the building is to be completed. May I make an appeal through your correspondence columns for help from all friends for the Church and its work in this time of need?

It may be interesting to many to know that provision has been made by the Church for gifts of individual pew chairs in the new hall of worship, which may be dedicated by inscribed name plates in memory of loved ones or in tribute to friends or public figures whose lives bear witness to truth and right. Such gifts may constitute living memorials which will serve mankind's needs for as long as The Community Church shall endure. Three hundred dollars endows a single chair. Chairs have been endowed in memory of, or in tribute to, more than one hundred persons, including Jane Addams, Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin Cardozo, George Washington Carver, Eugene V. Debs, Albert Einstein, M. K. Gandhi, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., Abraham Lincoln, Dr. Walter Rauschenbusch, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. Anyone wishing to help may send his gift to Reverend Donald Harrington, Ten Park Avenue, New York 16, New York.

DONALD HARRINGTON.

New York City, N. Y.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

BOARD ACTION

The Board of Directors of the Western Conference at its annual meeting in May voted that it should be the policy of the Conference during the coming year to work for the securing of 10 per cent increases in salaries for the ministers in the Conference. The board was aware of the excellent record made by many of our churches in this regard but felt that, on the basis of the contributions being made and what is expected of our ministers, there is still room for improvement.

The Annual Meeting referred the matter of the location of next year's sessions to the Board. The Board voted to accept the invitations of the two churches in Cincinnati.

Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, of St. Louis, and Mr. Nathan T. Ladenson, of Evanston, were elected to serve with the officers on the Executive Committee of the Conference.

AT THE MAY MEETINGS

"The dominant issue was the retention or the dismissal of the editor of the *Christian Register*. Charges of Communist affiliation were brought against him. Technically, the issue was his refusal to cooperate longer in an arrangement under which an advisory board had been set up to work with Mr. Fritchman in determining the character and complexion of the *Register*. In a somewhat manipulated device under which many of the delegates were not quite clear on what they were voting, the action of the board in dismissing Mr. Fritchman was apparently upheld by a substantial majority.

"One could wish that there had been voiced in the debate a little more zeal for and faith in the democratic processes for which the church is pledged to stand, and less vindictiveness and bitterness which were very much in evidence. This was not good and is symbolic of that sharp and intolerant derisiveness both in our denomination and in the world at large, which bodes no good for the future."

Tracy M. Pullman.

ON A.U.A. BOARD

The following persons from the Western Conference were elected to the Board of the American Unitarian Association at the May Meetings.

E. Burdette Backus, Regional Vice-President, Indianapolis.

Mrs. George Pieksen, for the General Alliance, St. Louis.

Mrs. Florence F. Bohrer, one year unexpired term, Bloomington.

Curtis W. Reese, Chicago, three-year term.

Others serving on the Board from this area are:
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis.
Julius E. Warren, University City, Mo.

DR. SNYDER TO RETIRE

On October 1 Dr. Charles E. Snyder will retire from the active ministry. For the past sixteen years he has been minister of the Unitarian Church in Davenport, Iowa. Prior to that he was for fifteen years minister at Sioux City, Iowa. Coming to the Western Conference from the North Side Church, Pittsburgh, he has played an active and leading role in the affairs of the Iowa Unitarian Association, the Western Unitarian Conference, and the American Unitarian Association. In addition to his contribution to the Unitarian Movement, Dr. Snyder has made notable contributions to the historical lore of Iowa. What Dr. Snyder plans for the future is not known other than the continuation of his historical studies and writings.

ROBERT TURNER

Robert S. Turner, for the past several years minister of the Unitarian Church in Hinsdale, Illinois, has resigned. During the next year he will devote full time to his ranch and camps in Wyoming. Mr. Turner will be greatly missed in Hinsdale and in the Chicago area. He served as chairman of the Hinsdale Community Caucus, as an officer of the Chicago Camping Association, and as Secretary of the Chicago Unitarian Council.

KONRAD BOSE

Rev. Konrad Bose will complete his work at Willmar, Minnesota, on September 1. He will devote full time to the Cooperative Group Health organization. However, Mr. Bose will still be working part-time for the Unitarian Movement. The Minnesota Unitarian Conference has elected him minister-at-large for the State. In this position his vigor and leadership will contribute much to the program of the Minnesota Conference.

GENEVA

All records for advance registrations for the Lake Geneva Unitarian Summer Assembly have been broken. There is every indication that our goal of five hundred will be reached. It is hoped that you will be one of them.

STOP COMMUNISM!

"The way to stop Communism on the world stage is to make sure that our nation's foreign policy coincides with the democratic principles which we profess. . . . [and] to give a demonstration to the peoples of the world that we sincerely believe in democracy ourselves and are ready to sustain it and hearten its adherents wherever they raise their standard. . . .

"The way to stop Communism at home is to go forward in implementing democracy among ourselves, remembering that changed conditions require new developments and that it is not enough to try to maintain the existing order. . . .

"The triumph of democracy is as certain in the long run as the ultimate victory of truth over falsehood. . . . It is for us to proceed with the creative task of establishing among ourselves, and encouraging among all men, a society which is genuinely administered in the interests of all men. If we really embody in our work the democratic faith which we profess, our triumph is assured. Communism will not only be stopped but will recede because it has been outdistanced in the race to serve mankind."

E. Burdette Backus.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY MIDWEST UNITARIAN SUMMER ASSEMBLY, COLLEGE CAMP, WISCONSIN, AUGUST 25-SEPTEMBER 1.